

PMOAG Draft Meeting Minutes

Date: April 28, 2010

Time: 10:03 am

Location: Cogswell Building, room 209

Attendees

Chuck Diaz, PMO; Staci Stolp, DPHHS; Mark Dousset, Axiom IT Solutions representing MITA; Bob Lopp, Eide Bailly; Fred Heil, DOJ; Evan Hammer, MSL; Gary Poepping, ITSD; Jim Sheehy, ITSD/PMO; Tammy Stuart, ITSD/PMO and Monica Abbott, ITSD.

Call to Order

- Chuck Diaz called the April meeting to order.

New Member Introductions

- Chuck introduced Fred Heil from DOJ as a PM. The second person who will be attending is Evan Hammer from the Montana State Library.

Approval of Minutes

- Chuck asked to approve the minutes from the January and March meetings.

**** Action Item ****

- Gary Poepping offered a motion to the approval of the January 13th minutes. Marc Dousset seconded.
 - The vote was unanimous.

Chuck explained in the March meeting minutes that he was to forward the RFI items for the PPM tool and he had decided to send it out after the answers came back. Tammy will post them to the SharePoint site. Tammy will mail the items to Marc. Chuck asked for volunteers for the RFP team. Fred Heil volunteered and will join the RFP team.

**** Action Item ****

- Marc Dousset offered a motion to the approval of the March 10th minutes. Gary Poepping seconded.
 - The vote was unanimous.

Project Management Methodology & Guidebook – Jim Sheehy

- Jim explained they hope to meet all of the objectives to ensure the Project Managers (PMs) can easily tell the purpose of each document that is in each phase. The PMs need to understand what should be accomplished during that phase and what it should look like when it is completed. Understand the order in which the documents need to be created and which documents are required to meet our MITA reporting requirements.

This documentation will add value to your organization. The target review dates are as follows:

- Ideation May 18 - May 24. 2-3 documents
 - Concept - June 9 - 30
 - Initiation and Planning - July 9-29
 - Execution and Monitoring - August 16-September 3
 - Delivery and Closure - September 7-20
 - Guidelines - October 12- 15
-
- On the State PMO website some [guidelines](#) have been posted. MITA does not dictate that we use one methodology. One of the charters of the PMO is looking to deliver a methodology that is definitive and standardized.
 - The methodology needs to be customized for the state and belongs to the state. We have a process where we do our IT planning and strategic goals for each agency. Ideation has to be there as an example of what should be done.
 - Fred stated that the intake mechanism for the pipeline piece is the more complicated piece of the methodology and really needs to have governance.
 - Chuck asked if there are any other questions.
 - Marc stated he has a guidebook but understands it is not the latest and greatest. Chuck referred him to the State IT PMO [website](#).
 - Chuck spoke about the process of methodology. The team will review the documentation, submit the changes that are required or desired and Chuck will review it. It will then come before this team for discussion. It will be presented to the State CIO. It will come back to this team and we will review the changes they are prescribing.
 - One of the goals is to reduce the pages to a reasonable number. Each individual phase will have the objective for the phase and what the outcome is supposed to be and the documentation you are supposed to have on that outcome.
 - The idea is to streamline it to tell you the minimum documentation you should have and to give you other levels of documentation to tighten up the phase.
 - A great concern is that we understand what the purpose of each phase is. The communication part is separate from methodology.
 - Each section of the methodology should be approved by the PMOAG and the State CIO prior to publishing, additionally only documents approved by this body will be published on the website. The intent is to have a methodology that will help all, no matter of their PM background or training.

PMOAG Charter

- Chuck incorporated the changes he received from Kristi Antosh. One item not incorporated was a signoff document for members that they clearly understand the charter. Chuck has extended an invitation to PMI chapters outside of main Montana Chapter to participate. Chuck asked for members to review the document so it can be

presented at the September workshop. Chuck would appreciate input or tell him if it is sufficient so the signoff document can be drawn up.

- Gary Poepping asked about the Chairman's Advisory Council whether it needs to be defined. Chuck replied it was discussed that it would consist of previous members of this group and that he would include a definition of the advisory council.
- Fred Heil asked if Chuck was willing to add subsection of goals. Chuck welcomed the idea and looks for ideas of those goals from the members. This information needs to be shared with bureau chiefs and others in our agencies.
- Chuck would like to change the verbiage where it states "Montana chapter of Project Management Institute" and instead have it say "a participating chapter of the Montana Project Management Institute (PMI) chapter" to allow subchapters to participate.
- On the Membership Criteria Fred asked about the difference between the board, the advisory group and the advisory council. Chuck explained that it was explained to him that the term board could not be used because of legality issues and that he will change the word board to group in the charter. The Advisory Council is meant to be a personal advisement of expert resources to the Chair.

PM Workshop - Tammy Stuart

- Handouts from Tammy included the Quarterly Workshop Agenda and a chart with results of the survey following the workshop held on March 29, 2010. Tammy explained the chart results of how we ranked for the workshop with an overall rating of 4.03 within the rankings of 1-5. Another survey will be completed after the next workshop.
- The draft agenda for the PMO Quarterly Workshop scheduled for June 9 will have 4 sessions.
 - Speakers coming from Fast Engine, Computer Associates, and Chuck will address PMO oversight. For the other session Pat Boles will present a session showing what is needed in Innotas for LFC reportable projects.
 - 7 PDU's are available to people attending.
 - Questions or suggestions for future workshops can be sent to Tammy Stuart.
 - The workshop will be held at the Red Lion for a cost \$50 with lunch included.
- Chuck explained that the PMO holds quarterly workshops. People wanting to speak as a presenter at workshops can contact Chuck or Tammy. Presentations need to be submitted 6 weeks before for approval from PMI. Ron Baldwin is acting as the resident PMP and reviews presentations and training materials for submission to PMI.
- Gary mentioned the survey indicated poor location and quality. Chuck mentioned there have been some issues in service from Red Lion but the Red Lion is a good value, is

convenient and for the most part done an excellent job. Chuck is trying to keep costs down and to go elsewhere it may cause the cost of workshop to increase.

- Vendors can demonstrate the education they have it will sell their services. People are looking for hands on in workshop classes.
 - Staci suggested the inclusion of a disclaimer as to what the classes are geared toward. Fred suggested adding a goal. What level it is geared for will help people pick appropriate classes.
 - Chuck is working to get the ability to certify the workshop.
- Chuck mentioned the PM Summit committee has disbanded. The PMO is not able to provide the manpower that is required behind the scenes in the development of the summit.
 - Chuck suggested we accept invitation from MITA IT conference to allow workshops and meeting at IT conference. The title of PM Summit is up for vendors if they want to take it over.
 - Tammy mentioned she has provided the members with the final meeting notes. Chuck reported he purchased the www.MTProjectManagement.org domain name as a donation to the cause and it will only be hosted for a short time to notify those concerned of the change in plans at which time it will no longer be hosted by ITSD.
- Evan Hammer from the Montana State Library arrived and was introduced.

Reporting Metrics & Standards – Chuck Diaz

- Chuck has submitted the document sent to members for adoption to the State CIO. Utilizing Earned Value (EV) as one of the methods in determining project status. Schedule, Budget, Issues, and Risk are the basis for reporting on the project's health and recommended thresholds for each component has been defined in this document. It will be necessary to separate the implementation from the worth of the concept. If we have the right PPM tool in place then the tool will do all of the work. The PMO will work to educate all concerned on understanding why projects move from green to yellow to red and that it does not necessarily mean that the [project is in dire trouble.
- In the document on project health Chuck is trying to give a guideline on how project status can be objectively defined we can gauge it and use it as an example.
 - Innotas is not fully configured and can be configured to except the criteria. However, this will not necessarily fix the problem if agencies are not including al the required information. Project Server is not a PPM tool but rather, a reporting tool and it is a great reporting tool. Innotas at this time does not allow for easy Im/Exporting of M/S Project and has caused many

issues with usability; this is why we are looking for a new tool. Chuck asked for questions or comments. Staci mentioned not having people duplicate the work they are doing. More integrated tools are needed.

- Project is the preferred desktop and needs to be project compatible. The tools have to port in and out of project as a clean portable application.
- Marc felt that the document did a great job explaining schedule but it didn't explain risks and issues enough. Chuck explained that the main concern for the document is to present an objective view of the project's status and that the definition of Issues and Risk will be contained in the PMO's Project Terms Definition document.

Open Forum

- Chuck went around the table asking for any comments.
 - Fred mentioned he is involved in Merlin.
 - Evan mentioned he is involved in the Association of Geographical Professionals. Chuck presented at the recent meeting.
 - Marc spoke about symposium with MITA. Chuck mentioned the timing is not right now but possibly put a panel together in September or at the IT conference.
 - Chuck wants to have the charter done by September but asked that maybe the best place to release the charter would be at the IT conference.
 - Chuck read the Mission Statement of the State IT PMO which he sent to Warren Dupuis. Chuck will send members a copy after it is approved.

Adjourn

****Action Item****

- Gary Poepping offered a motion to adjourn Marc Doussett seconded.
 - The vote was unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 11:44 am.